



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,964	10/23/2003	Gil Skaletzky	6287P013	1765

8791 7590 12/15/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

HSU, JONI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2671

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/692,964	Applicant(s) SKALETZKY, GIL	
	Examiner Joni Hsu	Art Unit 2671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>July 5, 2005</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on July 5, 2005 was filed after the mailing date of the application on October 23, 2003. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 10 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 10 and 12 recite the limitation “the method of *step* 9” or “the method of *step* 10” where it should recite “claim” instead of “step”. Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 35 recites “the sequence of associated control signal” where it should recite “the sequence of associated control signals”. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claims 50 and 52 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 50 and 52 recite the limitation “wherein one state of operation is a energy low *consuaption* state” where applicant is assumed to have meant “consumption” instead of “consuaption”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 17-21, 24-27, 29, 31-34, 36, 37, 39, 40, and 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stenzel (US005737032A) in view of Miyake (US005886912A).

8. With regard to Claim 1, Stenzel describes a method for processing video data by a cascade of video processing entities (36, 44, Figure 2; Col. 3, lines 32-39), the method comprising the steps of receiving, by a video processing entity of the cascade, input video data and associated control signals (Col. 3, lines 32-39; Col. 6, lines 12-15); processing the input video data, by the current video processing entity (Col. 9, lines 6-7); and allowing a next

cascaded entity to receive the output video data and the associated control signals (Col. 5, lines 65-67).

However, Stenzel does not teach determining, by the processing entity, in response to at least one associated control signal, whether to process the input data or to bypass the input data such as to provide output data; processing the input data, by the current processing entity, or bypassing the input data, in response to the determination. However, Miyake describes a method for processing data by a cascade of processing entities (Col. 1, lines 57-62), the method comprising the steps of receiving, by a processing entity of the cascade, input data and associated control signals; determining, by the processing entity, in response to at least one associated control signal, whether to process the input data or to bypass the input data such as to provide output data; processing the input data, by the current processing entity or bypassing the input data, in response to the determination (Col. 1, line 63-Col. 2, line 15); and allowing a next cascaded entity to receive the output data and the associated control signals (Col. 3, lines 52-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the device of Stenzel to include determining, by the processing entity, in response to at least one associated control signal, whether to process the input data or to bypass the input data such as to provide output data; processing the input data, by the current processing entity, or bypassing the input data, in response to the determination as suggested by Miyake because Miyake suggest that this increases the flexibility of the apparatus (Col. 1, lines 44-67).

9. With regard to Claim 2, Stenzel describes providing, by another entity (34, Figure 2), additional data to the processing entity (Col. 5, lines 32-34, 43-58).

10. With regard to Claim 4, Stenzel describes that the associated control signals comprise color component indication (Col. 5, lines 18-21).

11. With regard to Claim 6, Stenzel describes that the associated control signals comprise a valid indication signal (Col. 6, line 61-Col. 7, line 4).

12. With regard to Claim 7, Stenzel describes that the next entity is a next video processing entity (Col. 3, lines 32-39).

13. With regard to Claim 9, Stenzel describes that each input video data is associated to a pixel (Col. 3, lines 32-36).

14. With regard to Claim 11, Stenzel describes that each input video data is associated with a pixel color component (Col. 7, lines 5-23).

15. With regard to Claim 14, Stenzel describes that the video signals are provided by a pre-processing entity (34, Figure 2; Col. 5, lines 32-34, 43-58).

16. With regard to Claim 17, Stenzel describes that at least one control signal is responsive to a state of at least one video processing entity (Col. 6, lines 61-Col. 7, line 4).

17. With regard to Claim 18, Stenzel describes that at least one control signal is responsive to a state of at least one other entity that is coupled to the cascade (Col. 6, lines 61-Col. 7, line 4).

18. With regard to Claim 19, Stenzel describes that the at least one other entity is a termination unit or a memory unit adapted to provide additional information to a video processing entity of the cascade (Col. 6, lines 61-Col. 7, line 4).

19. With regard to Claim 20, Stenzel describes that the step of processing input video data by the current video processing unit involves at least one operation selected from the group consisting of rotation (Col. 9, lines 27-30) and picture brightness control operation (Col. 5, lines 26-27).

20. With regard to Claim 21, Stenzel describes that the step of processing input video data by the current video processing unit involves at least one operation selected from the group consisting of color format conversion (Col. 3, lines 36-39) and LCD display gamma adjustment (Col. 3, lines 61-66; Col. 13, lines 61-63).

21. With regard to Claim 24, Stenzel describes that the predefined entity (42, Figure 4; Col. 9, lines 64-65) is a termination unit that is coupled to the cascade of video processing entities (Col. 9, lines 64-65).

22. With regard to Claim 25, Stenzel describes a cascade of at least two video processing entities (36, 44, Figure 2; Col. 3, lines 36-39), whereas each video processing entity comprises an input interface (62) for receiving input video data and associated control signals (Col. 3, lines 32-39; Col. 6, lines 12-15; Col., 5, lines 43-58); and an output interface (86), for allowing a next cascaded entity (88, Figure 5) to receive at least the output video data (Col. 11, lines 55-60), as shown in Figures 2 and 5.

However, Stenzel does not teach logic for receiving at least one control signal and in response to select a selected path out of at least one processing path and at least one bypass path; whereas the selected path outputs output video data. However, Miyake describes a cascade of at least two processing entities (Col. 1, lines 57-62), whereas each processing entity receives input data and associated control signals; logic, coupled to the inputs, for receiving at least one control signal and in response to select a selected path out of at least one processing path and at least one bypass path (Col. 1, line 63-Col. 2, line 15); whereas the selected path outputs output data to a next cascaded entity to receive at least the output data (Col. 3, lines 52-56). This would be obvious for the same reasons given in the rejection for Claim 1.

23. With regard to Claim 26, Stenzel describes that the next cascaded entity (88, Figure 5) is video processing entity (Col. 11, lines 55-60).

24. With regard to Claim 27, Claim 27 is similar to Claim 2, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

25. With regard to Claim 29, Claim 29 is similar in scope to Claim 4, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

26. With regard to Claim 31, Claim 31 is similar in scope to Claim 6, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

27. With regard to Claim 32, Claim 32 is similar in scope to Claim 11, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

28. With regard to Claim 33, Stenzel describes that a first cascaded video processing entity (36, Figure 2) is coupled to a pre-processing unit (controller) such as to receive from the pre-processing unit a sequence of associated control signals (Col. 3, lines 39-48).

29. With regard to Claim 34, Claim 34 is similar in scope to Claim 11, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

30. With regard to Claim 36, Stenzel describes that the pre-processing unit (112, Figure 8) halts or restarts a provision of associated control signals to the first cascaded video processing entity in response to a status of at least one video processing entity (Col. 13, lines 45-47, 51-53; Col. 10, lines 33-37).

31. With regard to Claim 37, Stenzel describes that the pre-processing unit (112, Figure 8) halts or initializes a provision of associated control signals to the first cascaded video processing entity in response to a status of another entity that is coupled to the cascade (Col. 14, lines 30-33; Col. 13, lines 45-47, 51-53; Col. 10, lines 33-37).

32. With regard to Claim 39, Stenzel describes that the last cascaded video processing entity (44, Figure 2) is coupled to a termination unit (86) (Col. 10, lines 64-66; Col. 11, lines 55-60), as shown in Figure 2.

33. With regard to Claim 40, Stenzel describes that the termination unit (86, Figure 2) is an output converter (Col. 11, lines 55-60), which inherently outputs to a display, and therefore the termination unit is a display interface.

34. With regard to Claim 42, Claim 42 is similar in scope to Claim 17, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

35. With regard to Claim 43, Claim 43 is similar in scope to Claim 18, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

36. With regard to Claim 44, Claim 44 is similar in scope to Claim 19, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

37. With regard to Claim 45, Claim 45 is similar in scope to Claim 20, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

38. With regard to Claim 46, Claim 46 is similar in scope to Claim 21, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

39. With regard to Claim 47, Claim 47 is similar in scope to Claim 1, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

40. Claims 3, 13, 28, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stenzel (US005737032A) and Miyake (US005886912A) in view of Kirk (US006628290B1).

41. With regard to Claim 3, Stenzel and Miyake are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to Claim 1.

However, Stenzel and Miyake do not teach that the associated control signals comprise video type indication. However, Kirk describes that the associated control signals indicate whether the data is a blend of a plurality of textures with a single pixel or a blend of an individual texture with two pixels (Abstract). According to the disclosure of this application, video type indication indicates the manner in which the data is combined [0042] (Table 3). Therefore, Kirk describes that the associated control signals comprise video type indication.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the devices of Stenzel and Miyake so that the associated control signals

comprise video type indication as suggested by Kirk because Kirk suggests the advantage about being capable of selectively providing color values for at least two pixels blended with a single texture or color values for a single pixel blended with a plurality of textures (Col. 1, lines 11-16).

42. With regard to Claim 13, Stenzel does not specifically teach that video data can represent video data of at least one video type. However, Kirk describes that video data can represent video data of at least one video type (Col. 1, lines 11-16). This would be obvious for the same reasons given in the rejection for Claim 3.

43. With regard to Claim 28, Claim 28 is similar in scope to Claim 3, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

44. With regard to Claim 38, Claim 38 is similar in scope to Claim 13, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

45. Claims 5 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stenzel (US005737032A) and Miyake (US005886912A) in view of Terada (US004914574A).

46. With regard to Claim 5, Stenzel and Miyake are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to Claim 1.

However, Stenzel and Miyake do not teach that the step of determining involves comparing at least one control signal to a video processing entity mask. However, Terada

describes that the step of determining whether to process the input data or to bypass the input data involves comparing at least one control signal to a video processing entity mask (Col. 14, lines 2-19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the devices of Stenzel and Miyake so that the step of determining involves comparing at least one control signal to a video processing entity mask as suggested by Terada because Terada suggests that the mask is needed to mask the unrequired bits in order to obtain the coincidence signal, which indicates whether the coincidence or not is effected to indicate whether the data needs to be inputted in the module or bypassed (Col. 14, lines 12-19).

47. With regard to Claim 30, Claim 30 is similar in scope to Claim 5, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

48. Claims 8, 22, 41, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stenzel (US005737032A) and Miyake (US005886912A) in view of Gossett (US006236413B1).

49. With regard to Claim 8, Stenzel and Miyake are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to Claim 1.

However, Stenzel and Miyake do not teach that the steps of receiving, determining and processing are repeated until a predetermined video processing entity of the cascade allows a next entity to receive the output video data of the predetermined video processing entity. However, Gossett describes that the steps of receiving, determining and processing are repeated

until a predetermined video processing entity of the cascade allows a next entity to receive the output video data of the predetermined video processing entity (Col. 3, lines 5-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the devices of Stenzel and Miyake so that the steps of receiving, determining and processing are repeated until a predetermined video processing entity of the cascade allows a next entity to receive the output video data of the predetermined video processing entity as suggested by Gossett because Gossett suggests that this architecture facilitates fast and efficient processing (Col. 2, lines 1-15; Col. 3, lines 21-26).

50. With regard to Claim 22, Stenzel describes a method for processing video signals by a cascade of video processing entities (36, 44, Figure 2; Col. 3, lines 36-39), the method comprising the steps of receiving, by a video processing entity of the cascade, input video data and associated control signals (Col. 3, lines 32-39; Col. 6, lines 12-15); providing the input video data to a selected path out of at least one video processing path in response to at least one associated control signal; outputting the output video data from the path and outputting associated control signals (Col. 5, lines 65-67); and outputting video data to a predefined entity (42, Figure 4; Col. 9, lines 64-65).

However, Stenzel does not teach providing the input video data to a selected path out of at least one bypass path and at least one video processing path in response to at least one associated control signal. However, Miyake describes a method for processing signals by a cascade of processing entities (Col. 1, lines 57-62), the method comprising the steps of receiving, by a processing entity of the cascade, input data and associated control signals; providing the

input data to a selected path out of at least one bypass path and at least one processing path in response to at least one associated control signal (Col. 1, line 63-Col. 2, line 15); outputting output data from the selected path and outputting associated control signals (Col. 3, lines 52-56). This would be obvious for the same reasons given in the rejection for Claim 1.

However, Stenzel and Miyake do not teach that the steps of receiving, providing and outputting are repeated until a predefined entity receives the output video data. However, Gossett describes that the steps of receiving, providing and outputting are repeated until a predefined entity receives the output video data (Col. 3, lines 5-16). This would be obvious for the same reasons given in the rejection for Claim 8.

51. With regard to Claim 41, Stenzel does not teach that the first video processing entity stops to receive associated control signals when a predefined amount of video data is provided to the termination unit. However, Gossett describes that the first video processing entity (203, Figure 2) stops to receive associated control signals when a predefined amount of video data is provided to the termination unit (221) (Col. 9, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the device of Stenzel so that the first video processing entity stops to receive associated control signals when a predefined amount of video data is provided to the termination unit as suggested by Gossett because Gossett suggests that this is needed in order to determine whether the video processing entity has finished the multi-passing operation (Col. 9, lines 1-6), which facilitates fast and efficient processing (Col. 2, lines 1-15; Col. 3, lines 21-26).

52. With regard to Claim 48, Claim 48 is similar in scope to Claim 22, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

53. Claims 10, 12, 15, 16, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stenzel (US005737032A) and Miyake (US005886912A) in view of Furtner (US006778177B1).

54. With regard to Claim 10, Stenzel and Miyake are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to Claim 9.

However, Stenzel and Miyake do not teach that the steps of receiving, determining and processing are repeated until a predefined portion of an image is processed. However, Furtner describes that the steps of receiving, determining and processing are repeated until a predefined portion of an image is processed (Col. 6, lines 4-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the devices of Stenzel and Miyake so that the steps of receiving, determining and processing are repeated until a predefined portion of an image is processed as suggested by Furtner because Furtner suggests that this accelerates the rendering because it processes the pixels that have a fixed geometric relationship with one another together (Col. 1, lines 6-10; Col. 6, lines 4-17, 35-37).

55. With regard to Claim 12, Claim 12 is similar in scope to Claim 10, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

56. With regard to Claim 15, Stenzel describes that the video processing entity (36, Figure 4) outputs pixels to a termination unit (42, Col. 9, lines 64-65).

However, Stenzel does not teach that the steps of receiving, determining and processing are repeated until a predetermined amount of pixels are provided to a termination unit. However, Furtner describes that the steps of receiving, determining and processing are repeated until a predetermined amount of pixels are provided to a termination unit (114, Figure 1) (Col. 6, lines 4-17; Col. 8, lines 57-60). This would be obvious for the same reasons given in the rejection for Claim 10.

57. With regard to Claim 16, Stenzel describes that the termination unit is a memory unit (42, Figure 4, Col. 9, lines 64-65).

58. With regard to Claim 35, Stenzel does not teach that the pre-processing unit provides the sequence of associated control signals until the cascade processes a predefined portion of an image. However, Furtner describes that the pre-processing unit (102, Figure 1) provides the sequence of associated control signals until the cascade processes a predefined portion of an image (Col. 8, lines 38-44; Col. 6, lines 4-17). This would be obvious for the same reasons given in the rejection for Claim 10.

59. Claims 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stenzel (US005737032A) and Miyake (US005886912A) in view of Atkinson (US005991883A).

60. With regard to Claim 49, Stenzel and Miyake are relied upon for the teachings as discussed above relative to Claim 25.

However, Stenzel and Miyake do not specifically teach that at least one video processing entity is adapted to determine a state of operation in response to control bit values. However, Atkinson describes that at least one video processing entity is adapted to determine a state of operation in response to control bit values (Col. 9, lines 61-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify the devices of Stenzel and Miyake so that at least one video processing entity is adapted to determine a state of operation in response to control bit values as suggested by Atkinson because Atkinson suggests that this is needed so that the video processing entity knows to operate in a low power mode (Col. 9, lines 61-65). Having a low power mode is important for portable computers (Col. 1, lines 21-28).

61. With regard to Claim 50, Stenzel does not teach that one state of operation is a energy low consumption state. However, Atkinson describes that one state of operation is a energy low consumption state (Col. 9, lines 61-65). This would be obvious for the same reasons given in the rejection for Claim 49.

62. With regard to Claim 51, Claim 51 is similar in scope to Claim 49, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

63. With regard to Claim 52, Claim 52 is similar in scope to Claim 50, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

64. Claim 23 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

65. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art taken singly or in combination do not teach or suggest the method of Claim 22 wherein each path of the at least one processing path and the at least one bypass path have substantially the same latency, as recited in Claim 23.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joni Hsu whose telephone number is 571-272-7785. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on 571-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JH



Kee M. Tung
Primary Examiner